



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,555	08/16/2001	Nadir K. Amra	ROC920000316US1	4249
46296	7590	05/02/2005	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC IBM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENT 917, BUILDING 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,555

Applicant(s)

AMRA ET AL.

Examiner

Marissa Thein

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 12-29 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 18, 2005.

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-11 in the reply filed on January 18, 2005 is acknowledged.

Drawings

The drawings filed on August 16, 2001 are acceptable.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims scope are uncertain since the trademarks or trade names, "IBM WebSphere Commerce

Art Unit: 3627

Suite” and “J.D. Edwards One World”, cannot be used properly to identify any particular product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,675 to Meltzer.

Regarding claim 1, Meltzer discloses a network computer system comprising: a first computer system comprising an e-commerce system application (electronic commerce application, col. 80, lines 50-54; internal business, col. 78, lines 5-6) (col. 9, lines 17-20); a second computer (col. 9, lines 17-20) coupled to the first computer system, the second computer system comprising a back-end business processing system (external business, col. 78, lines 5-7; enterprise application, col. 2, lines 51-54); and an integration node (market maker node) coupled to the first and second computer systems, the integration node receiving messages (documents) in a first format from the e-commerce application, converting the messages (documents) in the first format to messages in a second format, and sending the messages (documents) in the

Art Unit: 3627

second format to the back-end business processing application (col. 9, lines 35-44; col. 78, lines 5-14; col. 78, lines 44-60).

Regarding claims 2-3, Meltzer discloses wherein the first computer system comprises: a first queue for sending for sending messages to the integration node; and a second queue for receiving messages from the integration node; and the wherein the second computer system comprises: a first queue for sending messages to the integration node; and a second queue for receiving messages from the integration node (col. 7, lines 43-51; col. 9, lines 34-44; col. 78, lines 5-14; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 6; col. 21, lines 41-54).

Regarding claims 4-5, Meltzer discloses wherein the integration node receives messages in the second format from the back-end business processing application, converts the messages in the second format to messages in the first format, and sends the messages in the first format to the e-commerce application (col. 7, lines 43-51; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 6; col. 21, lines 41-54); and wherein the integration node uses at least on XSL stylesheet (XSL style sheet, col. 76, lines 45-49) to convert the messages in the first format to the messages in the second format (col. 76, lines 1-49).

Regarding claim 6, Meltzer discloses wherein the messages (documents) comprise XML messages (XML documents), and wherein the integration node comprises: an inbound queue read mechanism that reads information from at least one inbound queue; an XML parser that processes XML messages; an XML transformation mechanism that converts and XML message in the first format to a corresponding XML message in the second format, and that converts

Art Unit: 3627

and XML message in the second format to a corresponding XML message in the first format; and an outbound queue write mechanism that writes at least one converted XML message to an outbound queue (col. 23, lines 38-60; col. 78, lines 44-60; col. 80, lines 45-54).

Regarding claim 9, Meltzer comprises a mechanism for synchronizing data in a first database accessed by the e-commerce application with data in a second data based accessed by the back-end business processing application (col. 8, lines 3-15; col. 9, lines 17-28; col. 78, lines 5-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,226,675 to Meltzer.

Regarding claims 7-8 and 10, Meltzer substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, it does not explicitly disclose the e-commerce application comprises an application implemented using IBM WebSphere Commerce Suite and wherein the back-end business processing application comprises an application implemented using J.D. Edward One World. Such recitation imparts no structural or functional specificity which serves to patentably distinguish the

Art Unit: 3627

instant invention from the other e-commerce application and back-end business processing application already disclosed by Meltzer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide any type of e-commerce application and back-end processing application in the system of Meltzer because the subjective interpretation of the e-commerce application and back-end processing application does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 11, Meltzer discloses the integration node receives messages in a second format from the business processing application via the first queue of the second message queue adapter, converts the message in the second format to messages in the first format, and sending the messages in the first format to the e-commerce application via the second queue of the first message queue adapter (col. 7, lines 43-51; col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 6; col. 21, lines 41-54).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,766,361 to Venigalla discloses a method and apparatus for the automated exchange of information, and the use of hierarchical protocol based upon an XML in order to enable machine-to-machine communication of data related to the availability of goods, services and information.

Art Unit: 3627

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0019797 to Stewart et al. discloses an enterprise wide electronic commerce system which allows trading partners to act as participants in a complex trading process.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174000 to Katz et al. disclose a method for assisting a user with procurement decisions, sourcing decisions and strategic sourcing decisions in an enterprise.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is 571-272-6764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mtot
April 17, 2005

James S. McClellan
JAMES MCCLELLAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Au 3627